REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 11, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 are now all the claims pending in the application.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,551).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

> "...**comparing cyclic redundancy check data of first input table information** in the section number of the broadcasting stream **with cyclic redundancy check data of subsequent input table information** in the section number of the broadcasting stream; and
>
> parsing and updating the table information **if the cyclic redundancy check data is changed.**"

The Examiner asserts that Ohishi Fig. 6 discloses an equivalent change detection in a broadcast table for data parsing/updating comparing a first section number CRC 32 and a second section number/CRC 32.

Ohishi is directed to a signal processing device and a method for switching signal processors. See Title of the Invention. In particular, Ohishi is directed to transmitting digital broadcasting programs broadcast through a first network to a second network by detecting a Network Information Table (NIT) from digital broadcast data on the first network and changing the NIT so as to be applicable to the second network. See col. 1, lines 12-21. Contrary to the

4

Examiner's assertions, Ohishi is not at all concerned with parsing and updating table information according to cyclic redundancy check data.

Fig. 6 illustrates a table structure of a Program Map Table (PMT). A table ID indicates the classification of a table, a PCR PID indicates a PID of the packing including a program clock reference, a stream type indicates the type of signal transmitted, and NIT indicates physical information on a transmission path. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of comparing cyclic redundancy check data of first input table information in the section number of the broadcasting stream with cyclic redundancy check data of subsequent input table information in the section number of the broadcasting stream and parsing and updating the table information if the cyclic redundancy check data is changed.

Further, Ohishi appears to suffer from the deficiencies in the prior art that the exemplary embodiment of the present invention attempts to cure. In particular, Ohishi discloses incrementing a version number when contents of a table are brought up to date. Col. 5, lines 57-65. Therefore, contrary to the claimed invention, Ohishi does not disclose updating table information if a cyclic redundancy check data is changed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 should be deemed allowable. To the extent claim 2 recites similar elements claim 2 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

II.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) and Cox et al. (Korean No. 000076757).

The Examiner asserts that the AAPA discloses an equivalent change detection in a broadcast table for data parsing/updating comprising comparing a first section number and a second section number as illustrated in Applicant's Fig. 1. Applicant submits that Applicant's Fig. 1 discloses reading version information of a table and determining whether the **version** is new or updated. If it is determined that the version is new or updated, the table is parsed and updated. However, instances where the version number is not changed, although content in a content table has changed, will result in failure of, for example, a digital television to work properly. See Applicant's specification paragraph bridging pages 1 and 2.

The Examiner further states that CRC is generally used for comparing data. The Examiner asserts that Cox discloses data comparing via data CRC comparison.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Cox discloses updating CRC information in a data storage device to detect errors of data. Cox discloses receiving input data, encoding the input data and generating integrity information by performing the encoding process. Received data and read data are decoded and during the decoding process, the integrity of the received data and the read data are determined. See abstract. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of comparing cyclic redundancy check data of first input table information in the section number of the broadcasting stream with cyclic redundancy check data of subsequent input table information in the section number of the broadcasting stream and parsing and updating the table information if the cyclic redundancy check data is changed, as claimed.

Further, the Examiner asserts that the combination of Cox with AAPA is obvious because such a modification would provide the AAPA with a technique where magnitude of original numbers is not required in a final comparing operation/computation.

However, Applicant submits that the combination of AAPA with Cox is not obvious and the Examiner's reasoning is merely a result of impermissible hindsight. In particular, assuming *arguendo* Cox taught the elements as claimed, modifying the AAPA would result in a substantial modification of the principle of operation of the AAPA, evidencing that the Examiner's reasoning is merely a result of impermissible hindsight. MPEP 2413.01. Moreover, as discussed above, Cox does not teach comparing CRC data.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 should be deemed allowable. To the extent claim 2 recites similar elements, claim 2 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

III.   New Claim

Applicant has added claim 3 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claim 3 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 2 for at least the reasons set forth above.   Moreover, the art cited by the Examiner does not teach the elements of claim 3.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 11, 2006